

COMMUNITY WEBS PROGRAM PHASE 1 EVALUATION REPORT

INTERNET ARCHIVE
JANUARY 2021

EDU^{CO}PIA
INSTITUTE
Community Cultivators



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	6
Section 1: Evaluation Framework	7
Methodology	7
Data Collection	8
Survey (see Appendix 1)	8
Focus Groups (see Appendix 2)	9
Topical Cohort Calls	11
Documentation Review	11
Team Meetings	12
Data Analysis	12
Section 2: Findings and Recommendations	14
Objective 1: Evaluation of Program Deliverables:	14
Findings	15
Reflections and Recommendations	16
Objective 2: Evaluation of Participant Development:	18
Findings:	19
Reflections and Recommendations:	19
Objective 3: Evaluation and Continued Work on Program Expansion:	21
Findings	22
Reflections and Recommendations	23
Objective 4: Evaluation of Community and Strategic Partnerships:	24
Findings	25
Reflections and Recommendations:	26

Objective 5: Sustainability and Business Planning:	28
Findings	28
Conclusion and Next Steps	30
Summary Recommendations	31
Appendices	33
Appendix 1: Cohort Survey Questions	33
Appendix 2: Focus Group Protocol	36
Purpose	36
Methodology	36
Materials	36
Script/Preamble	36
Appendix 3: Survey and Qualitative Analysis	38

Executive Summary

This report documents the design, methods, and results of Educopia Institute’s evaluation of the Internet Archives’ “Community Webs” project and provides recommendations for its transition from a successful grant-funded project into a thriving, community-driven program with a secure financial and organizational base.

The Community Webs project (IMLS RE-85-17-0060-17) was funded in 2017 to create a Community History Web Archives. The project provided training, continuing education, cohort development, technology services, and infrastructure to librarians from a diverse set of public libraries, empowering them to build collections of historically valuable, web-published materials. Participating libraries learned to archive the web-based histories of their local communities, with an emphasis on marginalized or traditionally underrepresented groups. During the project period, the resulting collection preserved over 245 new collections and 36 terabytes of web based community heritage data from 27 public libraries nationwide. The project has continued to expand, with 13 more libraries added in 2020.

Educopia Institute undertook this formal evaluation of the Community Webs project (2019-2020) in order to assist the Community Webs team to develop strategic partnership roadmaps, business plans, and community models that build directly on the project’s strengths. Educopia evaluators designed and implemented an evaluation framework that included surveys of participating libraries and librarians, analysis of the Community History Web Archives collections they built, and focus groups and topical calls with the core cohort. Based on our iterative findings, the Educopia evaluators guided the Community Webs team through a series of sustainability conversations to help them determine how best to scale the program’s activities and to explore how it might connect with digital library services and training for librarians and museums across the United States. Notably, this work has been directly impacted by the 2020 global pandemic and we have tried to integrate its

still-emerging fiscal and political implications for public libraries into our evaluation and recommendations.

Our findings include the following, each of which is elaborated in the report:

1. The Community Webs project either met or surpassed every deliverable, outcome, and success metric specified in the original grant project, including:
 - archiving more than 30 TB of web-published community history,
 - providing more than 15 librarians with strong skills in digital archiving,
 - producing a set of open access training materials, and
 - developing a small professional community that is actively advocating and promoting digital skills to other public librarians.
2. The project has also achieved early impact on the broader community, including raising awareness of and interest in web archiving in the wider professional community, and by capturing crucial local documentation about an event of historical magnitude that otherwise would have been lost (pandemic collecting).
3. The cohort participants have gained significant skills and knowledge in digital curation, description, and providing long-term accessibility to digital collections that will empower their continued work in this area. They have also uncovered a series of important decision points and practices that require deeper thought and documentation from a community of practice that can guide implementation.
4. Expansion of the project's community-of-practice will require buy-in and active engagement by current cohort members. The Community Webs cohort enthusiastically supports the project's transition into an ongoing program, and several cohort members are already signalling their interest and willingness to step into leadership and mentorship roles.
5. Interest in the project and in the work of web archiving far exceeds current funding and resource levels for onboarding and training new community members. Local funding and resource provisioning by administrators is unlikely to match local

interest by librarians and archivists in participating, though, which could be a stumbling block for program expansion.

6. Strategic partnerships could help to support Community Webs' expansion, particularly those undertaken with state libraries or DPLA (as hubs for public library direction) and with regional consortia. Understanding how and when to tap into these partnerships is made trickier by today's pandemic and the fiscal, bandwidth/attention, and travel limitations it has made manifest.
7. Many of the local challenges that cohort members faced during the project signal broader and shared challenges that public libraries *en masse* will likely have and that will need to be mediated carefully during program expansion. Specifically, participants found that while their participation was supported in name, extra time was not carved out for Community Webs participation. In most cohort members' experiences, they were the only staff member in the library allowed to engage in this work. When others were allowed to participate, it was usually only in locating new seeds. This raises broad sustainability questions, as continued engagement from any library hinges on a single point of failure.

This report begins with an introduction that describes the Community Webs effort and project accomplishments. We then describe our evaluation methodology, including our data sources and data framework. We provide an analysis of the data we gathered, reflecting on both the strengths and opportunities for growth of this program.

The remainder of the report documents our work with the team to begin to scale the program's activity during 2021-2023, including our recommendations for next steps in terms of the program's vision, infrastructure, financial structure, community engagement, and governance elements.

Educopia Institute greatly appreciates the opportunity to conduct this research with the Internet Archive, and we look forward to our future involvement in the next phases of Community Web's growth and maturation.

Introduction

In 2017, IMLS funded the Internet Archive to undertake *Community Webs: Empowering Public Libraries to Create Community History Web Archives* (RE-85-17-0060-17), with \$338,940 in direct funding for a \$725,084 Project Grant as part of the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program, in the Continuing Education category for Curating Collections.

Community Webs (2017-2019) proposed to provide training, continuing education, cohort development, technology services, and infrastructure to 15 librarians from a diverse cohort of 15 public libraries, empowering them to build collections of historically valuable, web-published materials. An increase in support from Internet Archive enabled the project to add 12 more public libraries to the initial cohort in 2017, bringing the total to 27 libraries. An additional 13 libraries were added toward the end of the project in late 2019 and early 2020, so that the project eventually involved public librarians in 40 public libraries.¹

Community Webs provided in-person and virtual training, applied education, open educational resources, and technology for creating extensive born-digital web archives. Participating libraries received training and technical support to document the digital outputs of their local communities, with an emphasis on collecting materials related to or authored by marginalized or traditionally underrepresented groups. Community Webs sought to empower public librarians to serve as leaders in digital archiving by providing long-term access to web-published records chronicling the lives and accomplishments of their communities.

The Internet Archive was awarded \$106,564 by IMLS in supplemental funding in 2019, to support a formal evaluation of the Community Webs program and to assist in developing strategic partnership roadmaps, business plans, and community models for building on the program's success. Evaluators Katherine Skinner, Jessica Meyerson, and Terra Graziani of Educopia Institute designed and implemented an evaluation and sustainability framework

¹ Because the final 13 were still acclimating to Community Webs when the evaluation process began in Fall 2019, the project team made the decision to restrict some of the evaluation work to the 27 libraries that had participated since 2017. Where relevant, this is noted below.

to help the Internet Archive with its planning toward scaling this project up into an ongoing program that can be mapped to other initiatives to increase the impact of the project on digital library services and training across the United States.

Below, we provide a detailed summary of the work we have completed with the Internet Archive and the Community Webs team in 2019-20, including our evaluation work and a set of facilitated activities that strengthened the program's administrative and community scaffolding over the course of the project period.

Many of these activities yielded immediate implementation, such as a series of topical engagement calls with the Community Webs cohort that allowed the project team to provide support, foster trust, and begin to solicit cohort input on future directions. Other activities were designed to lay groundwork for the expansion of the program in 2021, including exercises to clarify the project's vision and goals, to establish engagement strategies for a range of stakeholders beyond the cohort itself, and to envision a healthy and stable fiscal future for Community Webs.

In the course of this evaluation, much of our professional and personal worlds changed due to a global pandemic, a shift which the evaluators adjusted for in this evaluation.

Section 1: Evaluation Framework

Methodology

The Evaluation Framework was designed and implemented to fulfill several goals specified by the Community Webs program in its 2019 supplemental award, including the following:

- To document the program deliverables
- To understand what skills/competencies cohort members developed
- To establish and document the benefits of involvement for a variety of stakeholders
- To help determine how best to scale the program's activities

- To explore how Community Webs' success can be mapped to other initiatives to further the impact on digital library services and training for librarians and museums across the United States

This evaluation, conducted by Evaluators Katherine Skinner, Jessica Meyerson, and Terra Graziani of Educopia Institute, focused on five core objectives:

- Evaluation of Program Deliverables
- Evaluation of Participant Development
- Evaluation and Continued Work on Program Expansion
- Evaluation of Community and Strategic Partnerships
- Evaluation of, and Continued Work on, Sustainability and Business Planning

The methods used in the evaluation included:

- Survey
- Focus Groups
- Notes from Cohort Topical Calls
- Notes from Project Team Calls
- Documentation Review

Data Collection

Survey (see [Appendix 1](#))

Evaluators designed and administered a survey for cohort members that focused on analyzing the educational, collection, and progressional outputs of the original two-year Community Webs project. The survey included 37 questions and was administered through SurveyMonkey. Twenty of the questions used Likert scale to rate a set of options, and the rest were open ended. Survey invitations were sent by email to 27 cohort members by the Internet Archive project team via SurveyMonkey on March 11, 2020, and again on March 28th, 2020. The additional 13 cohort members who joined the project in late 2019 were not surveyed, as they had not had enough experience with the work to participate in the survey.

at the time. Survey invitations were sent to 27 cohort members with brief instructions, and several follow-up emails were sent to all cohort members with reminders. Once a survey was completed, survey responses could not be revised.

The survey asked questions related to, but not limited to: cohort members' experience with training modules, curriculum topics, technical support needed, collecting practices, buy-in from their institutions, communications and public engagement, and how Community Webs might sustain itself or expand going forward. Questions asked included:

- Training: What training materials were most of use to participants and other librarians?
- Training: Did the training topics cover the range of issues encountered by participants?
- Training: Which training materials or educational resources were most valuable? Which were least valuable? What topics were not addressed but should have been?
- Collecting: Did the digital collections created supplement and/or expand the participating institution's overall historical collections?

Thirteen of the 27 cohort members who received the survey responded to it. Given the timing of the survey, which coincided directly with the global pandemic's expansion and the growth of the Black Lives Matter movement, our team believes this response rate is deceptively low and not indicative of participant buy-in and interest, but rather of global and national crises. The open-ended feedback collected in the survey was coded based on the five core objectives of the evaluation, and the findings for each objective are outlined in the subsequent section of this report.

Focus Groups (see [Appendix 2](#))

Building on the results of the retrospective evaluation survey, Educopia evaluators conducted a series of three focus groups with cohort participants from April to June 2020. The focus groups were designed to inform the development of the Community Webs

program expansion framework, including how best to structure its governance, community engagement strategies, and financial model. They also sought to understand what forms of support cohort members needed, including training and guidance for building accessible digital community archives.

Each call focused on three sets of questions on local community, strategic direction, and growth models. Focus groups allowed cohort members to not just answer the questions, but also interact with one another in discussion. This yielded nuanced feedback on the program and its relationship to other work that each participant was engaged in.

As with the survey, the timing of the focus groups coincided directly with the global pandemic's expansion and the growth of the Black Lives Matter movement. We know from cohort members' direct responses that this timing compromised the ability for many public librarians to participate due to furloughs, closures, and the overwhelming weight of external factors such as child care, health concerns, and local and national protests. The stress and fatigue of this moment was felt particularly by public librarians, who already balance such a challenging dual role, serving simultaneously as community hubs with social work duties in addition to their collection-building and access provision activities.

This timing also impacted the topical interests of focus groups, which allowed space for cohort members to talk with each other about collecting opportunities and issues that were arising in dramatic ways due to the pandemic and social movement activities. These conversations included questions and concerns about how to handle permissions, what to prioritize, and how to balance local and national coverage in a moment of crisis. Talking with cohort members as these shifts were taking place proved invaluable for project team discussions regarding program growth and sustainability.

Focus group invitations were sent to all Community Webs cohort members by the Internet Archive project team. Of the 31 invitees, 9 participated, with 3 cohort members attending the first call, 1 attending the second, and 5 attending the last call. Each focus group was structured for up to 10 attendees. Sessions lasted one hour each. Each focus group opened with a standard script relating the focus group's purpose, the rights of each member, how

data would be collected, and with whom it would be shared. Each focus group agreed to allow the evaluators to record the call for the sole purpose of aiding in note taking. All focus group recordings were maintained by Educopia and were only made available to the three evaluators engaged in this project. All recordings were deleted after notes were reviewed.

In each focus group, we posed the same 5-10 open-ended questions to promote discussion. Project team members from the Internet Archive were not involved in the focus groups in order to encourage full participation from cohort members without self-censure. Focus groups were facilitated by the evaluators, and detailed notes were taken by another evaluator. All focus group participants had access to the focus group notes and were invited to make corrections prior to the conclusion of the call.

Focus group findings substantiated and built on initial survey findings. Findings and resulting recommendations are discussed in detail in the "Findings and Recommendations" section of this report.

Topical Cohort Calls

Throughout the evaluation period, Educopia evaluators worked with the Internet Archive team members to design, conduct, and document a series of topical open calls with cohort members. These cohort calls were intended to serve a dual purpose: first, providing cohort members with a designated space for peer support, and second, providing the project team with feedback.

Topics for these calls were chosen based on feedback gathered in the survey and through cohort interactions with the project team. The project team hosted five topical calls during the subaward period, some focused on what cohort members should collect during the pandemic, and some focused on social media best practices in web archiving. Four cohort members attended the first call, five attended the second, seven attended the third, three attended fourth, and four attended the fifth. The sessions lasted an hour, and were facilitated by a member of the project team, with evaluators attending and taking notes.

Evaluators analyzed the notes from these calls to further elucidate program accomplishments and gaps. Due to the conditions of the pandemic, discussion often focused on how to account for logistical changes and support one another through any difficulties related to the pandemic. Questions posed during these calls included, but were not limited to:

- What platforms and communication tools are you using most right now? Are you using new ones?
- What challenges are you running into with local documentation of COVID-19?
- What would help you to participate? What could help create capacity for your colleagues who are working from home to participate in web archiving?

Documentation Review

Evaluators reviewed a broad range of project documentation throughout the project period to inform our work, including all grant materials relating to the original award (including interim report and final report), the calls for applications, cohort training materials and OERs provided by WebJunction, member summaries, internal program feedback from the 2017-2019 project, and collected content (including what was collected before 2020, and also what was collected during the pandemic). Evaluators also reviewed cohort white papers, training materials and notes, and conference presentations, which provided more context on cohort experiences in the cohort and helped evaluators better craft recommendations. We also reviewed collection development policies for five of the participating libraries.

We used these materials to inform the construction of the evaluation framework. These materials helped us to hone in on challenges, opportunities, and gaps as we developed the survey and focus group scripts. They also provided the evaluators with crucial context and information about the project that helped us to design the Sustainability Framework and conduct team meetings to support the Community Webs team as it planned towards the expansion and scaling up of this work into an ongoing program. These documents also

helped us to understand the range of perspectives involved in the project to date, and to think about the broader range of stakeholders that might become engaged in the future.

Team Meetings

We conducted team meetings between the Internet Archive project team and the Educopia evaluators on a biweekly basis for the length of the subaward period. These calls were a space to reflect on cohort development, move forward program deliverables, build capacity for the expansion of the program, and share findings iteratively from the survey, focus groups, literature and curriculum review, and cohort calls.

Our evaluation elucidated program accomplishments, determined areas of greatest success and possible improvements for various program activities, and recommended modifications to the education, training, and professional development work of the program. Findings and recommendations are organized in reference to each of the evaluation objectives below.

Data Analysis

Evaluators did three major forms of data analysis in this evaluation:

1. An analysis of the results of the survey ([see Appendix 3](#));
2. Qualitative coding of notes from focus groups and cohort calls ([see Appendix 3](#));
3. Synthesis of calls with members of the project team regarding perceived successes and known areas of improvement;
4. Review of project deliverables to determine accomplishments versus aims;

For the survey analysis, evaluators produced a summary of results across respondents for each of the 37 questions. For those questions that asked respondents to rate choices, averages were created for each of the choices and listed from highest to lowest rated.

In the qualitative analysis of focus groups and cohort calls, all input from cohort members was coded using the following seven codes based on evaluation objectives:

1. Local community
2. Cohort community
3. Local sustainability
4. Program sustainability
5. Growth models & Expansion
6. Funding & Cost modeling
7. Strategic Directions & Partnerships

These codes were chosen because they map directly to the five core objectives (listed above) that served as the basis of this evaluation. The focus groups were intended to build on what was learned in the survey by elucidating more detailed feedback from cohort members on program expansion, governance, community engagement, financial modeling, and the support needed for their work.

Cohort input was secondarily coded based on subtopics, which included:

1. Telling Stories / Online Exhibits with Web Archiving
2. Advocacy for Web Archiving as a Practice
3. Collection Development
4. Ethics in Web Archiving
5. Representation in Web Archives
6. Outreach via Web Archiving
7. Social Media Collecting
8. Training Yourself + Team

Evaluators also factored in the geographic location of public librarians in this analysis, as being located in a small town versus large metropolitan area had an impact on what their collections looked like as well as what support they needed. After coding cohort input, evaluators analyzed the results of each code. Not surprisingly given the project's local collecting focus, the largest amount of the data we reviewed and/or coded related to "Local

Community.” This coding label’s applicability likely also increased as cohort members were attempting to respond to several layers of unusual local activity during our evaluation period, including the pandemic, increased reporting of police violence, increased white supremacist group activities, and increases in the Black Lives Matter movement and activity.

The findings from this analysis are summarized throughout the [findings and recommendations](#) section below.

Section 2: Findings and Recommendations

Objective 1: Evaluation of Program Deliverables:

The Community Webs project aimed to produce a range of both short-term and longer-term outcomes, including the following:

- Fifteen librarians will have new skills in web archiving and digital curation
- A small professional community will form and further advocate and promote digital skills for local history collecting
- Open access training materials will expand opportunities for digital curation and web preservation
- More than 30 TB of collections, 30 presentations about the project, and a suite of open access training materials will be produced and used
- The community of practice will continue to grow following the project
- Cohort members will become mentors and trainers in addition to archiving web content themselves
- Participating libraries will explore new forms of patron engagement and programming based on the web archiving work and collections they have built

Educopia’s evaluation of program deliverables included our review of the cohort and its activities; the course curriculum, training materials, and educational tools and methods;

cohort publications and presentations; the Community History Web Archives collection, and survey and focus group data. Our evaluation of these deliverables was based primarily on their impact in the web archiving community during and following the grant period; where possible, we also tried to incorporate projections of future impact.

Findings

The Community Webs project either met or surpassed every deliverable, outcome, and success metric specified in the original grant project, including the following:

- archiving more than 30 TB of web-published community history (36 TB and more than 245 collections)
- providing more than 15 librarians with skills in digital archiving (27 librarians from 17 states during the project period)
- involving a diverse set of libraries in the cohort in terms of sizes, statures, funding levels, and populations served
- producing a set of open access training material, including a self-guided online training module
- developing a small professional community that is actively advocating and promoting digital skills to other public librarians beyond the grant period
- publishing and presenting more than 30 outputs, including conference papers and posters, blog posts, bibliographies, white papers, policies, webinars, and lesson plans

This project achieved all of its specified goals and laid a solid foundation upon which a program can be built. With more than 100 public libraries applying for the project's 15 initial slots, the project also conclusively demonstrated that there is high interest in web archiving infrastructure and training support in public libraries.

The project also has already achieved early impact on the broader community, including the following:

- Making publicly available trainings and educational materials on web archiving which have been accessed 1,828 times during the grant period

- Raising awareness of and interest in web archiving in the wider professional community
- Capturing crucial local documentation about events of historical magnitude that otherwise would have been lost (pandemic collecting, BLM movement collecting)
- Recognizing and identifying gaps in “best practices,” knowledge, and policy documentation, especially regarding privacy concerns in web archiving
- Ongoing investment and engagement by cohort members in continuing to collect and connect with the community of practice

We elaborate on these measures in our reflections and recommendations below.

Reflections and Recommendations

The project clearly delivered all of its promised outputs, and its broader impact is already both visible and measurable. Several of these outputs will live well beyond the project period, including the collections that have been built and the community of practice that is steadily adding to these collections. The significant investment made in training and cultivating relationships between the 40 individual cohort members is one that can be expected to continue to grow and develop in unexpected ways as each of those individuals carries what they have learned forward.

We predict some outputs from the project may have a shorter lifespan (as should be expected), especially the educational resources, which we will cover more in depth in the next section. While the OERs and self-paced learning opportunities created in this project were a significant “lift” and asset for the grant period, they have quickly become dated. As the Community Webs project matures into an ongoing program, it will need to plan for the challenges of management, upkeep, and updating of educational resources to match the ever-changing technical and policy environment in which web archiving takes place. It will also need to think carefully about how to sunset and/or replace materials once they are out-of-date so that they do not lead to confusion or misunderstanding.

The most striking evidence of Community Web’s success, and a strong indicator of its continued impact, is the level of enthusiasm and engagement we have witnessed in the

cohort members. Of the total cohort of 40 librarians, 26 engaged with the evaluation team through the survey, focus groups, and/or topical community calls. Many of these participants have indicated their desire for more opportunities to connect with each other and with the Community Webs leaders, and to continue their professional development both through training and through mentoring others.

Cohort members did note several things that the team will want to attend to moving forward, including prioritizing cohort-wide meetings (in person, ideally, though travel funding may make this impossible even post-pandemic), which all survey respondents ranked as “important” or “very important” in shaping the model of programmatic web archiving in their library. As the program expands in 2021, the team may want to test multiple onboarding strategies to see what impact the in person vs. virtual sessions might have on participation and on learning.

Cohort members also cited the need for more training, both for themselves and also for others in their library, and they drew attention to particular segments of training that need further development. Eight out of eleven survey respondents ranked the Web Archiving 101 training module “very helpful,” while only five rated the Collection Development training module “very helpful,” and only three respondents rated the Community Engagement training module as “very helpful.” Respondents rated all of the training models as “neutral” or “helpful;” none of the training models were rated “not helpful.” Based on these responses, it is clear that the Community Engagement and Collection Development modules may need updating most quickly. In terms of new content, survey respondents expressed their desire for future curriculum topics, including “Troubleshooting Web Crawls: Patch Crawling” (highest rating), and “Using the Archive-It API” and “Broadening Community Engagement” (next, rated equally high).

In order for the Community Webs program to meet its goals to modify and expand the education, training, and professional development work of the program, the program team should:

- Establish a concrete plan for modifying and expanding the educational, training, and professional development work of the project to support the network's expansion, and ensure that the modules are developed so that they may be able to be used for different audiences.
- Based on the evaluation findings, the project team should update the set of training and professional development materials. Wherever possible, these materials should be made "evergreen," but the project team should also estimate and note when and how each module might need further updates as they are being recorded and produced.
- Establish a community-led process for regular evaluation and updating of training materials. This may include forming a professional development committee or an editorial board to oversee the curriculum.

Objective 2: Evaluation of Participant Development:

The Community Webs project was structured deliberately to advance knowledge and practice of web archiving among public librarians. The project sought to equip librarians with new skills in collection building and digital curation and to apply these directly to the challenge of capturing and preserving their own communities' web-based historical documentation. The success of the project hinged directly on the degree to which participating librarians were able to and supported in making collection decisions, develop "seeds" for web crawls, document what they were collecting, and conduct accurate crawls (verified through quality control measures).

The evaluators assessed the project's participant development through three main data sources: analysis of the collections the participants built, self-report by participants in surveys and focus groups, and demonstrated knowledge through presentations, white papers, and publications produced during and following the grant period.

In the Evaluation of Participant Development phase, evaluators Skinner, Meyerson, and Graziani analyzed survey data on participant experience, including, but not limited to, answering questions such as:

- What hurdles did participants face in meeting program expectations on collecting and professional activities?
- What aspects of the professional development, cohort activities, and cohort funding were most successful? What aspects would merit additional attention or funding?
- What would participants like more of from the program? Less of?
- What expectations do participants have as far as their ongoing participation in the program or their continued pursuit of the activities established by the program?

The results are synthesized below.

Findings:

The project accomplished all of its goals, including equipping librarians with technical skills, sharing workflows and best practices, and creating a cohort structure that assisted participating librarians as they worked to document the history of their local communities. The program was also successful in developing a community of practice that cohort members participated in to learn from one another.

During the funded period, cohort members gathered collections on Local History, Elections, Art, Community-Economic Development, Sports, Infrastructure, Environment and a host of other topics relevant to their local communities. Following the funded period, cohort members created substantial collections about local responses to, and the impact of, COVID-19, the Black Lives Matter Movement, and the national and local elections of 2020.

Cohort members were exposed to training and educational materials on Web Archiving 101, Collection Development, Community Engagement, Sustainability, and Access and Research in Web Archives through both virtual learning sessions and in-person meetings. This training enabled them to develop comprehensive and sustainable collections representative of their local communities and contexts. Training included asynchronous

virtual modules, in-person classes, and even one-on-one training sessions during in-person cohort events.

Many cohort members trained and mentored additional librarians and volunteers in their community to help identify collections, and a few tried to train others to develop seeds and crawls as well. Cohort members also shared lessons learned through open calls, focus groups, and a private WebJunction forum. In addition to this peer-to-peer learning and sharing, cohort members also advanced knowledge about web archiving within the broader public sphere via co-authored journal publications, conference presentations and collaboration with local community partners.

We elaborate on these measures in our reflections and recommendations below.

Reflections and Recommendations:

The resounding success of Community Webs in its development of skills and knowledge in a cohort of public librarians is evidenced across all of our data sources. The cohort learned and applied its new knowledge in collection building throughout and beyond the project period. The cohort members also actively taught and mentored others, both locally (staff and volunteers) and nationally (via presentations and publications), providing a substantial secondary impact on the field.

Cohort members continue to seek more engagement with the community of practice that Community Webs has seeded, including through regular calls, as well as training and mentorship opportunities. Although the open calls and peer support hours in the project, as well as the focus groups, topical calls, and survey gave them space to share and give feedback with the Internet Archives team, cohort members consistently requested more time to share with one another and to learn from each others' personal experiences doing web archiving work within the context of a specific department or local context. When asked what they would like "more of" in the Community Webs program, one cohort member replied, "I would like to see more interaction between cohort members; I would like to have a community of support. We are a small number of people dispersed

throughout the country who are doing this work in isolation at times. It would be nice to build that sense of community through regular communication and check-ins."

In-person events were rated highly and considered one of the greatest rewards for initial involvement, including the travel support that made these possible for many of the participants. Continued involvement of cohort members does not seem to depend upon external incentives (e.g., the travel funds provided in the initial grant). However the significant lack of resources in the public library sector, including time and attention, may hinder the engagement of public librarians, both from this initial cohort, and also in an expanded community in the future. Establishing clear ROI for involvement, and coupling this with scaffolding that makes it easy for community members to step up when possible and step back as needed will help tremendously in nurturing the ongoing engagement of this group.

During the project, cohort members received structured training and feedback time with the project team, and they highly valued this experience. The areas of greatest reported need for cohort members are in the technical realm, where cohort members reported that they needed more guidance from the team on best practices for web archiving. While technical troubleshooting often took place during open calls, the cohort members cited a desire for more one-on-one time to ask technical questions and get feedback on their collecting practices.

In order for the Community Webs program to continue to foster professional development and community with an expanding program, we recommend that the Internet Archive (IA) team:

- Organize peer check-ins and provided office hours infrastructure with light facilitation and note taking to create space for inter-cohort communication
- Organize tech support office hours to answer questions on Archivelt and to provide feedback, or a "gut check" on web archiving practices

- Create a set of resources and templates that will allow for cohort leadership development and increased community ownership by cohort members over time
- Continue engagement with and expand participation in the “community of practice” via working groups and affinity groups; begin building documentation within these groups
- Develop materials and strategies for the program staff to be able to build community leadership and support the cohort in cross-pollination and other forms of professional development

Objective 3: Evaluation and Continued Work on Program Expansion:

Since its outset, the Community Webs project has hoped to seed a scalable program that could serve the public library community in the future in ways that are consistent with the Internet Archive’s success with web archiving in other sectors, including academic libraries. The *Evaluation and Continued Work on Program Expansion* phase has focused in part on helping the Internet Archive team to devise frameworks and models for scaling the existing program and to outline the challenges and approaches for expanding the program from 40 institutions to potentially hundreds of additional participants nationwide.

As mentioned previously, the number of applications to the Community Webs project far exceeded the expectations of its creators and the space and funding that the project could offer. Additional funding and subsidies beyond the IMLS grant were secured in order to nearly double the number of participating institutions; however even this additional funding was not able to meet the interest demonstrated by the number of qualified applicants from the community. This points to an unmet need and desire in the public library community for tools, training, and resources to do local history web archiving.

In the *Evaluation and Continued Work on Program Expansion* phase, the evaluators focused primarily on the results of the survey pertaining to growth models and strategic directions. We also analyzed the overall structure implemented by the project team during the grant

to onboard, train, and support cohort members.

Findings

The Community Webs project team has built up program infrastructure and cohort participation in a way that effectively sets the program up for further expansion. The project team has been successful in establishing a base infrastructure that supports onboarding and training of cohort members with a diverse array of educational offerings and ways to engage with the cohort. The mix of asynchronous, virtual components and more intensive synchronous sessions provides an array of opportunities that satisfy a number of different learning styles and that appeal to the novice and intermediate web archivist.

The team has also developed numerous communications with the cohort, largely in one-off communications geared toward immediate need and project milestones or deliverables. These are not currently packaged or available to project team members for reuse in onboarding new members, but they do provide a solid foundation for an onboarding program.

Team/evaluator working sessions were used to explore a number of successful community modeling strategies, and in them we discussed an array of approaches to program scalability. Findings from the survey and focus groups were directly applied to this work, including to inform the project team about which components were most valuable (e.g., the 101 virtual class was very useful, but other offerings less so), and to strategize about low-lift activities that could provide high pay-off (e.g., hosting the topical community calls).

By the end of the evaluation, the project team secured funding through the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support the continued expansion of the program through 2022, which will involve building on several of the recommendations of this report.

Reflections and Recommendations

In order to scale up the Community Webs program with sufficient support for cohort members, the project team will need to hire a full-time coordinator. The program depends on consistent attention and support to onboard and integrate new cohort members, troubleshoot web archiving questions, facilitate intercohort engagement, establish strategic partnerships with synergistic programs (e.g., DPLA), and to plan and implement a community-led governance structure and mentorship program. Over time and once the community infrastructure is stabilized, the full-time coordinator may be reduced to a part-time facilitator role.

Cohort member involvement will be crucial to an effective scaling up of the program. Half of survey respondents said they would be interested in working with Community Webs to build out a “hub” in their area. And, details and capacity contingent, ten out of the twelve survey respondents said they would be interested in playing a role in the expansion of Community Webs beyond their region or state.

Functionally, cohort members need easy-to-access training materials and opportunities that they can provide to their colleagues (both those in their own library and those beyond their library) to empower them to undertake web archiving work. Three-fourths of survey respondents thought this could be achieved easily or very easily by adapting cohort trainings for colleagues and administrators. One cohort member said, Community Webs library participants “might be able to bring more staff into this if that kind of community scaffolding [peer groups and support infrastructure] existed. It’s a challenge for me, as head of dept, I don’t usually do tech hands-on stuff. I’m doing that with web archiving. It’s the only project like that for me that I haven’t delegated--so complex, getting someone else up and running is so hard. We have different staff with different technical knowledge. Diving in and figuring it out isn’t something that everyone’s good at. Having clear instructions - need to be very well described.”

In order for the Community Webs program to meet its goals to devise frameworks and models for scaling up a program, we highly recommend that the Internet Archive team:

- Hire a full-time community coordinator for the Community Webs program
- Design workflow resources for bringing other library staff into web archiving work
- Engage with Community Webs library administrators directly via calls, webinars, or other communication to build their understanding of and support for their web archiving program
- Integrate network building into Community Webs' ongoing plan to expand the network of stakeholders who might benefit from the work
- Establish outreach materials that can be distributed through "hubs" for public libraries, including PLA and DPLA, that provide ongoing updates about the success of Community Webs and its impact and that spotlight Community Webs participants (e.g., brief "spotlight" articles or briefer banners that could be posted on twitter that include a quote from a participating library)
- Program expansion will also rely upon establishing easy ways to onboard new libraries that are paying for services. The evaluators recommend working with an existing invoicing hub (e.g., LYRASIS or OCLC) to potentially de-bulk this process, whether through an outright consortial agreement or simply in order to quickly process billing.

Objective 4: Evaluation of Community and Strategic Partnerships:

In the *Community & Strategic Evaluation* phase, evaluators worked with the project team to identify and pursue (or plan to pursue) strategic opportunities for partnering with other organizations. We also worked with the project team to begin exploring what community-based governance (formal or informal) might look like, and how community

members might engage in the scaling up process to help build out the Community Web program on a national scale.

Directors of the Community Webs program had been pursuing strategic partnerships and collaborations during the original two-year grant timeline, though this was not a specific activity of the original grant. Calls and partnership exploration took place with state libraries and archives and with national institutions such as DPLA and Library of Congress. These conversations have taken many forms, from distributed collection hosting and aggregation to event hosting to joint ventures and financial relationships. Additional funding has also been sought from various foundations and grant-making organizations. The evaluators have assist in this strategic partnership planning by suggesting possible models for different consortial and shared services approaches to areas such as program expansions (including invoicing/billing), community modeling, strategy roadmaps, and scenario planning. This work was intended to help bring a cohesive, focused vision to pursuing strategic opportunities to build out Community Webs in a collective, community-driven, fashion that can have self-reinforcing benefits for scalability.

Evaluators analyzed evaluation data related to several programmatic areas that could affect community and strategic partnership, including the following:

- Local Community: How can the program better document and support the relationships between participating librarians and their local communities, especially in light of the many public programming, local outreach activities, crowdsourcing approaches, and efforts to document underrepresented groups in their regions?
- Strategic Directions: The original Community Webs program focused on public libraries, however building digital collections documenting local communities is not only the province of public libraries. The Community Webs creators have already started to lay the groundwork (including through separate IMLS funding focusing on art libraries) to expand the program to other types of collecting institutions, such as

museums, historical societies, and municipal and state government institutions.
 What avenues of strategic growth and alignment are most valuable?

- Strategic Partnerships: What partner institutions best align with the goals and objectives of Community Webs? What can different types of strategic partners bring to the program? What mutual benefit might be realized through partnering with consortia or service providers who have broad relationships with public libraries?

Findings

The Community Webs program has been successful in fostering community and strategic partnerships. The importance of having collections informed by and used by local partners has been central to the program since its inception. Through educational materials and intercohort sharing of best practices, the Community Web program prioritized building a strong network in its curriculum. For example, cohort members were looking for ways to involve community members in collection development in a way that represented the diversity of their communities. In their work to effectively document their communities, public librarians saw opportunities to involve those in their communities whose lives and work should be documented in the process. All survey respondents said they could imagine crowd-sourcing web history from library patrons, but they sought guidance on how to best involve patrons and community members while respecting their time and efforts. Building these community relationships will help to ensure the long term success of the program.

During the project period, the team conferred with DPLA and the Library of Congress about possible ways to coordinate activities for mutual benefit. The collection-building activities of these public libraries could complement the work of DPLA, and the hub-spoke partnership model that DPLA has pioneered provides a potential model for Community Webs for training, network expansion, and overall cohesiveness.

Reflections and Recommendations:

There continues to be a real lack of public understanding of web archiving as a practice. Potential collaborators in cohort members' communities don't know what web archiving is

or understand its value. In order for cohort members to be able to document the most salient content, they need to collaborate with local community members and institutions. However, several cohort members expressed concern that community members are, for the most part, unaware of the value of web archiving as a method. One cohort member said, "My perception is that the project is misunderstood and the importance not seen as entirely relevant. We are diligently working to educate administration and the public about the importance and need for web archiving within our community."

Cohort members are unsure what the landscape of web archiving is in their community, and who else (if anyone) is doing web archiving. Public librarians need efficient, proven ways to engage directly with their community to raise awareness, identify potential collaborative partners, and train volunteers to help with identifying and describing potential collections. The vast majority of survey respondents foresaw requests from researchers to use their Archive-It collections, but were unsure how to connect with them in the collection development phase. Increasing engagement with community members may also help to ensure that the collections they build match the use-needs of their own patrons.

Cohort members were very concerned about the ethics of their collecting practices during this time and requested training and professional development on ethical collection development practices. In documenting what was going on in their local communities this year, public librarians wanted to be mindful to protect community members' privacy while also capturing local history. In order to be intentional about this, they requested that the Community Webs team lead the cohort in developing common collecting practices that struck a balance between respecting privacy and documentation.

Cohort members also want to make sure what they're collecting is representative of racial, class, gender and sexual orientation, organizational type, and makeup of their communities. Cohort members felt it was important to represent the whole of their community in their web archiving. In open calls, cohort members discussed different ways to do this and shared best practices across different cities. In one open call, a cohort member said, ""We would like to prioritize "our under-documented communities including

Latinx, African-American, Filipino, homeless and teen groups as well as local political activism and arts/culture." Cohort members also inspired each other to think about new collecting possibilities, including those who participated in calls in March and April who had not considered COVID-19 or BLM collecting activities prior to those calls.

In order for the Community Webs program to meet its goal in assisting and building community partnerships and strategic collaborations, the team should:

- Consider how to build and launch a public campaign in concert with public libraries about web archiving and its role in local history
- Build an outreach template for cohort members to use to recruit and onboard their own volunteers and/or strategic partners
- Create spaces to highlight cohort members who are pioneering good practices, e.g., through “spotlight” articles and Twitter banners that can be shared both with and beyond the cohort
- Facilitate the cohort’s development of actionable principles and values for web archiving and the Community Webs program, including guidance documentation on a range of topics (see e.g. the recent OAPEN OA Books Toolkit writing process, which channeled the energy of volunteers to produce a full toolkit for OA Book development)
- Organize speakers for the cohort to provide ethical collecting models that are used in other collecting areas
- Develop resources that help librarians reach out to and involve underrepresented groups in web archiving work in an efficient way
- Document clear sets of strategic partnerships that could be advantageous, and schedule out milestones for reaching out to each set (e.g., associations, consortia, leadership voices, etc.)

Evaluators elucidated of methods of successful community modeling, recommended approaches to program scalability, and provided guidance on strategic opportunities.

Objective 5: Sustainability and Business Planning:

One of the motivations of the original Community Webs proposal, and one of the ongoing challenges, is around the sustainability of born-digital curation activities within under-resourced public libraries and smaller cultural heritage organizations. While Community Webs has addressed these problems programmatically and in its training materials, the lack of funding and limited staff resources in public libraries is an ongoing challenge. Sustainability and business planning during the Community Webs project was intended to explore when, how, and from whom to generate revenue from Community Webs services, as well as explore ways that the Community Webs model of cohort-based applied training, subsidized technical services, targeted professional development, and OER creation can be ported to other areas of librarianship and library professional development beyond just digital curation in public libraries.

In the Strategic & Business Evaluation phase, the evaluators focused on the results of the survey, focus groups, and topical calls, as well as results from workshopping sessions with the project team. We established a first pass at understanding what opportunities there might be, both within and beyond Internet Archive, for funding and operationalizing a scaled up version of the Community Webs project. We also drafted initial business and cost scenarios. The sustainability evaluation was also informed both by the experiences of the cohort and emerging trends in the cultural heritage sector more broadly.

Findings

The Community Webs project was successful in exploring sustainable models of generating income for and spreading its applied training and technical services community of practice model developed during the grant period. This activity was impacted by the global pandemic, however, and the project team and evaluators are aware that flexibility has to be maintained in the short term while we see how the fiscal pressures of 2020 impact local budgets and bandwidth for public libraries.

The Community Webs program can currently be distilled into five key program areas: Training, Cultivating a Community of Practice, Public Programming, Tech Support, and Resources. The Internet Archive team, in collaboration with Educopia staff identified these as key areas of activity in the Community Webs program and will continue to use them as the program expands.

The Community Webs program could fit into a range of organizational models, including 501(c)3 nonprofit status, Limited Liability Corporation (LLC), or as a program hosted by a fiscal sponsor. The Community Webs team is exploring a range of scenarios and types of independence that the program could have, taking into consideration funding models, political activity, and existing institutional infrastructure offered by Internet Archive currently.

Community Webs as a program going forward would most likely be subsidized in part by grants or private donations from foundations, corporations, or private donors. The project team felt that the program fit nicely into the nonprofit grant funding model, given its goal to create web archive materials for the benefit of the public.

Reflections and Recommendations

The maintenance of the Community Webs cohort is a foundational element of the Community Webs program, and highlighting the geographic diversity of program participants will be important to its future success.

In order for the Community Webs project to meet its goal in developing specific sustainability plans, program expansion plans and milestones, organizational stability, and a thriving community apparatus, we recommend that the project team:

- Use the evaluation findings to propose pacing, stakeholder representatives, requirements, and a roadmap for establishing Community Webs' governance model
- Concretize the mission and vision of Community Webs, and unify all existing platforms around that mission and vision (e.g., the website and other public-facing locations)

- Build a stable visual identity for Community Webs that can be used across all training materials, unifying these as a single professional development program
- Develop onboarding documentation and a smooth training pathway for new cohort members
- Design and implement a communications plan for Community Webs, including core channels, messages, and goals for initial campaigns in 2021-2022
- Engage current cohort members in mentorship and begin training them to take on community leadership roles in the near future
- Articulate the program areas, activities, and services in a cohesive way across all public Community Webs materials, including the website

Conclusion and Next Steps

This report has synthesized the findings from Educopia Institute’s evaluation of the Community Webs project and provided recommendations for its transition from a grant-funded project into a sustainable community of practice with an organizational base. The evaluation found that the Community Webs team met or surpassed every deliverable of the initial grant-funded project including archiving more than 30 TB of web-published community history material, training 40 public librarians across the country in web archiving, producing a set of open access educational materials for web archiving, and developing a community of practice for public librarians using web archiving to document local history. There has been enormous interest in the program, but this may not translate neatly into support for its expansion, particularly from resource-poor public library administrations. Exploring a mixed-revenue model that might include membership and service fees, but also sponsorships, training, and other sources, is crucial if this project is to scale up and build a resilient base, particularly in the current funding climate.

Fully 65% of the cohort members engaged in the evaluation process, even though the level of crisis that all cohort members were facing at the time was unprecedented, and we know many were restricted by their own circumstances. We know that members of the cohort

were dealing with challenges that made any extra activity more challenging than usual to take on. The evaluators have concluded that the response rate indicates strong participant buy-in and interest, even during the strain of global and national crises. The passionate involvement of this community is, itself, a valuable resource that will assist the project's transition into an ongoing community and program.

The findings and recommendations outlined in this report work directly to inform the next phase of the Community Webs program, which will focus on carrying out the program expansion, strategic partnerships, and business planning elements of the program. We are grateful to have contributed to the development of a sustainable future for the Community Webs program.

Summary Recommendations

In order to further develop and maintain the Community Webs program, we recommend that the project team do the following:

Cohort Development & Support

- Establish a concrete plan for modifying and expanding the educational, training, and professional development work of the project to support the network's expansion, and ensure that the modules are developed so that they may be able to be used for different audiences.
- Based on the evaluation findings, the project team should update the set of training and professional development materials. Wherever possible, these materials should be made "evergreen," but the project team should also estimate and note when and how each module might need further updates as they are being recorded and produced.

- Establish a community-led process for regular evaluation and updating of training materials. This may include forming a professional development committee or an editorial board to oversee the curriculum.
- Organize peer check-ins and provided office hours infrastructure with light facilitation and note taking to create space for inter-cohort communication
- Organize tech support office hours to answer questions on Archivelt and to provide feedback, or a “gut check” on web archiving practices
- Create a set of resources and templates that will allow for cohort leadership development and increased community ownership by cohort members over time
- Continue engagement with and expand participation in the “community of practice” via working groups and affinity groups; begin building documentation within these groups
- Design workflow resources for bringing other library staff into web archiving work
- Integrate network building into Community Webs’ ongoing plan to expand the network of stakeholders who might benefit from the work
- Facilitate the cohort’s development of actionable principles and values for web archiving and the Community Webs program, including guidance documentation on a range of topics (see e.g. the recent OAPEN OA Books Toolkit writing process, which channeled the energy of volunteers to produce a full toolkit for OA Book development)
- Organize speakers for the cohort to provide ethical collecting models that are used in other collecting areas
- Develop resources that help librarians reach out to and involve underrepresented groups in web archiving work in an efficient way
- Engage current cohort members in mentorship and begin training them to take on community leadership roles in the near future

Internet Archive Team Development

- Hire a full-time community coordinator for the Community Webs program
- Develop materials and strategies for the program staff to be able to build community leadership and support the cohort in cross-pollination and other forms of professional development

Fundraising and Business Planning

- Document clear sets of strategic partnerships that could be advantageous, and schedule out milestones for reaching out to each set (e.g., associations, consortia, leadership voices, etc.)
- Use the evaluation findings to propose pacing, stakeholder representatives, requirements, and a roadmap for establishing Community Webs' governance model
- Concretize the mission and vision of Community Webs, and unify all existing platforms around that mission and vision (e.g., the website and other public-facing locations)
- Build a stable visual identity for Community Webs that can be used across all training materials, unifying these as a single professional development program
- Develop onboarding documentation and a smooth training pathway for new cohort members
- Engage current cohort members in mentorship and begin training them to take on community leadership roles in the near future
- Program expansion will also rely upon establishing easy ways to onboard new libraries that are paying for services. The evaluators recommend working with an existing invoicing hub (e.g., LYRASIS or OCLC) to potentially de-bulk this process, whether through an outright consortial agreement or simply in order to quickly process billing.

External-facing Deliverables

- Articulate the program areas, activities, and services in a cohesive way across all public Community Webs materials, including the website

- Design and implement a communications plan for Community Webs, including core channels, messages, and goals for initial campaigns in 2021-2022
- Engage with Community Webs library administrators directly via calls, webinars, or other communication to build their understanding of and support for their web archiving program
- Establish outreach materials that can be distributed through “hubs” for public libraries, including PLA and DPLA, that provide ongoing updates about the success of Community Webs and its impact and that spotlight Community Webs participants (e.g., brief “spotlight” articles or briefer banners that could be posted on twitter that include a quote from a participating library)
- Consider how to build and launch a public campaign in concert with public libraries about web archiving and its role in local history
- Build an outreach template for cohort members to use to recruit and onboard their own volunteers and/or strategic partners
- Create spaces to highlight cohort members who are pioneering good practices, e.g., through “spotlight” articles and Twitter banners that can be shared both with and beyond the cohort

Appendices

Appendix 1: Cohort Survey Questions

1. Please provide your first and last name
2. What is your title?
3. How long have you been in this position?
4. What was your primary motivation for getting involved in Community Webs?
5. Please rank the importance of the two in-person cohort meetings in shaping the model of programmatic web archiving within your library.
6. How helpful was each curriculum module in preparing you for the development of your web archiving program?
7. Which additional topics would you like to see addressed in future curriculum or training modules?
8. How easily do you think the Community Webs training modules could be adapted or extended to train other librarians in your library or in your library system?
9. What additional support would be helpful for you to transition from trainee to trainer for web archiving?
10. Please tell us how your Archive It crawls have complemented or expanded your library's historical collections.
11. Please rank the factors that have guided your web collecting and archiving decisions in order of importance (1 being most important, and 7 being least important).

12. If you have a policy that has guided your collection development you are willing to share, and you have not already shared it with the team, please upload it now. (If you prefer to share a link for a website where the policy has already been published, please proceed to the next question.)
13. If you have a published policy that has guided your collection development please provide a link to the webpage featuring the policy.
14. In deciding what to collect, who did you reach out to (select all that apply)?
15. Did you act as a “lone arranger” during this project, or did others from your library and/or patron community get involved in archiving through this project? Please describe.
16. How many hours per week (on average) did you (or colleagues) spend on web archiving?
17. Were you able to complete we archiving activities in addition to your regular duties with ease, or was it difficult to balance?
18. What level of institutional buy-in did you receive from your administration regarding the Community Webs program?
19. What are your expectations regarding your institution’s ongoing participation in the program or continued pursuit of the activities established by the program?
20. Would a call or webinar about Community Webs targeted at an administrative audience be helpful in advocating for support and continued growth of your web archiving program?
21. Did you encounter challenges participating in the cohort-building aspects of Community Webs?
22. If you did encounter challenges participating in the cohort building aspects of Community Webs, can you describe those challenges.

23. What would you like to see more of from the Community Webs program?
24. What would you like less of from the Community Webs program?
25. Are there obvious aspects of local, regional history that have been excluded from the current crawl scope that you would like to include as your web archiving program continues to grow?
26. What specific opportunities for diversity, equity, and inclusion do you see in the Community Webs program?
27. Can you imagine crowdsourcing web history from your library patrons?
28. Based on this project experience, do you feel that you know how to encourage library patrons to engage with your web archiving collection?
29. How did you communicate internally with colleagues, administrators, and volunteers about the project and/or new collections you established?
30. How did you communicate externally with patrons, public officials, other institutions, and the larger community about the project and/or the new collections you established?
31. Do you foresee requests from researchers about your Archive-It collections?
32. Do you keep statistics on visits to your web archiving collections, or any other current evidence of researcher engagement?
33. If you do keep track of researcher engagement with your web archiving collections, what was your median number of visits on a monthly basis in 2019?
34. Would you be willing and interested in playing a role in the expansion of the Community Webs program beyond your region or state?
35. Which consortia does your library currently belong to?

36. How much does your library or library system currently invest in community/consortial programs and services?
37. One way to increase web archiving activity among libraries in your area could be to establish a hub and spoke model. Hubs would be responsible for training other librarians in the areas, soliciting seeds from other libraries in the area or from branch libraries, and possibly also be responsible for running crawls. Would you be interested in working with Community Webs to build out a “hub” in your area?

Appendix 2: Focus Group Protocol

Purpose

Building on the results of the retrospective evaluation survey, these focus groups will inform the development of a framework for Community Webs program expansion including governance, sustainability, and digital curation best practices in services of building archived, accessible born-digital community history collections.

Methodology

Invitations will be issued to Community Webs partners. Each focus group will be structured with up to 10 attendees. Sessions will last one hour each. In each focus group, we will pose the same 5-10 open-ended questions to promote discussion. Focus group facilitators will be trained using the script to promote study reliability. One team member will facilitate and one team member will take notes, and conversations will be recorded if participants allow.

Materials

- Consent
- Zoom environment

Script/Preamble

"Hi, Good Morning. The date is. Thank you for your participation in this focus group sponsored by the IMLS-funded project "*Community Webs: Empowering Public Libraries to Create Community History Web Archives (RE-85-17-0060-17)*," a project of the Internet Archive. In this project, the Educopia Institute is helping IA to conduct an external evaluation of the Community Webs project and to plan towards its future iterations. My name is [name 1]

and I am [title] with the Educopia Institute. I will be moderating these focus groups alongside [name 2], [role] at [affiliation].

These focus groups will explore possible futures for the Community Webs program. Our discussion today will inform ongoing work to determine how best to scale the program's activities and also help us to understand how its success can be mapped to other initiatives to further the impact on digital library services and training for librarians and museums across the United States.

Audio of this interview will be recorded and possibly transcribed. We will use the recording and possible transcription solely to support our efforts to understand the readiness and/or need for emulation services within participants' organizations. If the project team considers any other uses, we would reach out to you beforehand to obtain your informed consent.

With that understanding, do you consent to today's interview being recorded? Do you have any questions about the process? Please signal your willingness to participate in this recorded focus group by stating "yes" in the chat window.

Are there any questions about these terms before we start?"

[Appendix 3: Survey and Qualitative Analysis](#)